

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the subject application.

Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12-25. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended the various independent claims, where applicable, to more clearly define the following features:

- a) a print job management system is provided to each print device;
- b) the data that is stored when a two-way type print job is executed is job information;
- c) each print job includes a body of data and job information; and
- d) when a two-way type print job is executed, the print job submitting device transmits the body of data to an initial print device, and the initial print device uses the spooled corresponding job information to execute the print job.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ferlitsch* (US 2002/0089692 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claim 17, as amended herein.

Applicant has amended claim 17 to specify that the print job includes a body of data and job information, and that the print job submitting device sends the body of data directly to one of the print devices in execution of a two-way type print job that requires a two-way communication with the print device at the time of printing.

The *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose a print job submitting device that sends the body of data directly to one of the print devices as in the presently claimed subject matter. As

such, for at least this reason, the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claim 17.

Accordingly, independent claim 17, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Ferlitsch*.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ferlitsch* in view of *Tanaka* (US 2002/0186410 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of the *Ferlitsch* and *Tanaka* references would not have rendered the subject matter defined in independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 18-25, as amended herein, obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

The presently claimed subject matter involves, when changing printers for executing a two-way type print job, transferring the job information stored in the initial printer to another printer, and notifying the client that the initial printer has been switched to another printer.

The *Ferlitsch* reference discloses methods and systems for printing error recovery. In particular, the *Ferlitsch* reference discloses a technique for distributing print tasks to a plurality of printing devices and automatically recovering from errors. Specifically, when an error occurs, the print task may be redirected or redistributed to another available printing device.

The *Tanaka* reference discloses an apparatus and method of controlling plural processing modules. In particular, the *Tanaka* reference discloses a technique for redirecting a print job to another device (i.e., a device that belongs to the same group or the same model) when some problem occurs in a device that is initially supposed to carry out the print job.

The Applied References Distinguished from the Presently Claimed Subject Matter

As a precondition, when executing a two-way type print job, the configuration defined in the present independent claims keeps the print data in a print job submitting device (i.e., a client) and transmits only the corresponding job information to an initial printer. Neither the *Ferlitsch* reference nor the *Tanaka* reference discloses or suggests this feature. Moreover, neither the *Ferlitsch* reference nor the *Tanaka* reference addresses the problems to be solved by the presently claimed subject matter.

Further, the configuration defined in the present independent claims sends the print job submitting device a notification that includes the address of another printer and an instruction for switching the destination of the two-way communication. For a print job, both *Ferlitsch* and *Tanaka* provide the body of data as well as the job information to a printer. Consequently, in the case of either reference, if the print job is to be redirected, there is no reason to notify the client of the new destination of the print job. Thus, neither the *Ferlitsch* reference nor the *Tanaka* reference discloses or suggests providing a notification that includes the address of another printer and an instruction for switching the destination of the two-way communication, as specified in the presently claimed subject matter.

In summary, neither the *Ferlitsch* reference nor the *Tanaka* reference discloses or suggests, as a precondition to the execution of a two-way type print job, keeping the print data in a print job submitting device and transmitting only the corresponding job information to an initial printer. Further, since both references fail to disclose or suggest the above-noted precondition, the *Ferlitsch* and *Tanaka* references necessarily do not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of providing a notification that includes the address of another printer and an instruction for switching the destination of the two-way communication.

In view of the foregoing, even if the *Ferlitsch* and *Tanaka* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the result of this combination would not

have included each and every feature of the presently claimed subject matter. As such, the combination of *Ferlitsch* in view of *Tanaka* would not have rendered the presently claimed subject matter obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 18-25, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Ferlitsch* in view of *Tanaka*. Claims 2-6, each of which depends from claim 1, claims 8-12, each of which depends from claim 7, and claims 14-16, each of which depends from claim 13, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Ferlitsch* in view of *Tanaka* for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to the applicable independent claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-25, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP039).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Peter B. Martine
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer No. 25920